

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**MICHAEL ROSS PERRY,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**CAROLYN W. COLVIN,**  
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:12-cv-1506-PK

**ORDER**

**Michael H. Simon, District Judge.**

United States Magistrate Judge Paul Papak issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on July 1, 2014. Dkt. 28. Judge Papak recommended that the decision by the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) finding Plaintiff not disabled and denying his application for supplemental security income under Title XVI of the Social Security Act be reversed and remanded for further proceedings. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C.

§ 636(b)(1)(C). If a party files objections to a magistrate’s findings and recommendations, “the

court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report[.]”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (the court must review de novo magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Papak’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Judge Papak’s Findings and Recommendation, Dkt. 28. The Commissioner’s decision is **REVERSED AND REMANDED FOR FURTHER PROCEEDINGS**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 22nd day of July, 2014.

/s/ Michael H. Simon  
Michael H. Simon  
United States District Judge